State of California Business, Transportation and Housing Agency Department of Transportation

Prepared By: Terry Abbott Chief Division of Local Assistance (916) 653-1776 PROGRAM STATUS
Local Assistance Lump Sum Allocation
Resolution:

CTC Meeting: February 28, 2002

Reference No.: 3.6

Original Signed by
ROBERT L. GARCIA
Chief Financial Officer
February 1, 2002

QUARTERLY LOCAL ASSISTANCE LUMP SUM ALLOCATION STATUS REPORT FOR 2001-2002 FISCAL YEAR

Background

The Local Assistance Program administers the local assistance subvention budget under authority of the California Transportation Commission (Commission). The Commission provides an annual lump sum allocation consistent with the Budget Act. The Commission further delegates to the Department the authority to adjust allocations for local assistance and report to the Commission if any transfers in or out of an expenditure category exceed 10 percent of the total allocation.

In June 2001, the Commission passed Resolution FM-01-02, the allocation of funds for local assistance for fiscal year 2001-2002. The allocation included approximately \$79 million in state funds and \$917 million in federal funds for a total of \$996 million.

Local Assistance Lump Sum Allocation Status for Fiscal Year (FY) 2001-2002

As of December 31, 2001, \$308 million or 31% of the \$996 million allocated has been expended. These funds were allocated for 468 local projects. The majority of these funds are for:

Surface Transportation Program – 169 projects, \$144.9 million Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality Program (CMAQ) - 95 projects, \$80.7 million TEA Program, Regional Share - 64 projects, \$28.4 million

The remaining 140 projects are a summary of all other funds or 30% of the total projects.

Thirty-four percent of the federal funds allocated have been expended while less than 5% of the state funds have been used. The delay in receiving the federal apportionments has prevented the exchange of approximately \$50 million in state funds. Most of this amount is expected to be allocated in the 3rd quarter.

Two categories have exceeded the original allocation made by the Commission. The Miscellaneous category has expenditures exceeding 200% of the allocation for this category. However, this represents only \$6 million of the total \$308 million expended to date. A preliminary review of the charges indicates some mischarging to this category is occurring. Corrections are expected by next quarter.

The Demonstration Projects category also exceeded the amount initially allocated. The allocation request for this category was initially zero since specific projects expected to receive funds during this fiscal year were not known. Including a category for Demonstration projects in the allocation from the Commission allows the Department to make allocations for these projects using excess funds from other categories.

The delivery to date for fiscal year 2001-02 (\$308 million) is slower compared to the same period last year (\$505 million). This difference between the two years can likely be attributed to the fact that federal fiscal year 01/02 federal apportionments had not been allocated as of December 31, 2001. Once the apportionments are allocated, the expenditures are expected to increase. Based on historical data, the fiscal year 2001-02 CTC allocation should be fully expended.

Attachment

LOCAL ASSISTANCE FUNDS FY 2001-02 (As of December 31, 2001)

(Dollars in 1,000)

| | | | | | | Allocation | | | Percent of | Number of | |
|---|----------------|---------|---------|--------------------|---------|------------|---------|-----------|------------|---------------------|----------|
| Fund Description | CTC Allocation | | | Total Expenditures | | | Balance | | | Allocation Expended | Projects |
| • | State | Federal | Total | State | Federal | Total | State | Federal | Total | Total | Total |
| Surface Transportation Pgrm (STP) | | 331,100 | 331,100 | | 90,294 | 90,294 | 0 | 240,806 | 240,806 | 27.3% | 160 |
| Congestion Mitigation & Air Qual Pgrm (CMAQ) | | 350,235 | 350,235 | | 11,456 | 11,456 | 0 | 338,779 | 338,779 | 3.3% | 60 |
| Bridge Seismic Retrofit State Match | 15,000 | 54,300 | 69,300 | 608 | 8,400 | 9,008 | 14,392 | 45,900 | 60,292 | 13.0% | 40 |
| Highway Bridge Rehabilitation & Replacement (HBRR) | | 98,645 | 98,645 | | 4,387 | 4,387 | 0 | 94,258 | 94,258 | 4.4% | 33 |
| Bridge Scour & State Match | 900 | 3,300 | 4,200 | | | 0 | 900 | 3,300 | 4,200 | 0.0% | |
| RR Grade Crossing Protection | | 20,363 | 20,363 | | 5,043 | 5,043 | 0 | 15,320 | 15,320 | 24.8% | 14 |
| RR Grade Crossing Maintenance | 4,250 | | 4,250 | | | 0 | 4,250 | 0 | 4,250 | 0.0% | |
| Railroad Grade Separations | 7,500 | | 7,500 | | | 0 | 7,500 | 0 | 7,500 | 0.0% | |
| Hazard Elimination & Safety (HES) | | 18,000 | 18,000 | | 5,635 | 5,635 | 0 | 12,365 | 12,365 | 31.3% | 32 |
| Demonstration Projects | | 0 | 0 | | 37,485 | 37,485 | 0 | (37,485) | (37,485) | | 12 |
| State Match for Transportation Enhancement Activities | | | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Transportation Enhancement Activities Exchange | 3,000 | | 3,000 | | | 0 | 3,000 | 0 | 3,000 | 0.0% | l |
| Transportation Enhancement Activities, Regional Share | | 39,760 | 39,760 | | 12,988 | 12,988 | 0 | 26,772 | 26,772 | 32.7% | 63 |
| RSTP State Match and Exchange | 46,000 | | 46,000 | | | 0 | 46,000 | | 46,000 | 0.0% | 1 |
| Miscellaneous | 2,100 | 1,100 | 3,200 | 3,001 | 3,680 | 6,681 | (901) | (2,580) | (3,481) | 208.8% | 9 |
| Total Local Assistance Subvented Funds | 78,750 | 916,803 | 995,553 | 3,609 | 179,368 | 182,977 | 75,141 | 737,435 | 812,576 | 18.4% | 423 |
| FTA Transfers | | | | | 125,451 | 125,451 | 0 | (125,451) | (125,451) | | 45 |
| Total Local Assistance Including FTA Transfers | 78,750 | 916,803 | 995,553 | 3,609 | 304,819 | 308,428 | 75,141 | 611,984 | 687,125 | 31.0% | 468 |

Assumptions:

- $\hfill \square$ The amounts do not include Freeway Service Patrol or Bay Area Ferry Operations.
- □ FTA transfers are \$54,577,700 for RSTP, \$69,251,555 for CMAQ and \$1,622,000 for TEA. These numbers are through December 2001.
- ☐ Misc. expenditures include projects not included elsewhere.
- ☐ Balances are based on allocation requests.
- $\hfill\Box$ The Allocation balance is the difference between CTC allocation and Total Encumbrances.
- □ FAU/FAS allotment and expenditures is shown under STP
- □ Expenditures and Number of Projects is from new LP2000 report Local Assistance Funds dated Jan 18, 2002.